

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/903,211	07/11/2001	Yoshiaki Hiratsuka	2500.65689	9972	
7590 12/02/2005		EXAMINER			
Patrick G. Burns, Esq.			SEFER, AHMED N		
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
300 South Wacker Drive			2826		
Chicago, IL 6	0606		DATE MAILED: 12/02/2009	DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/903,211	HIRATSUKA ET AL.	(m)				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		A. Sefer	2826					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address	S				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS OF TIME MAILING DANSIONS OF THE MAILING THE MAI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for a cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this commun DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Secondary</u>	entember 2005.						
2a)□	<u> </u>	action is non-final.						
3)								
7,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 2-7 and 9-21 is/are pending in the app	olication.						
۰ الحکار	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>2-6 and 9-14</u> is/are allowed.							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 15-21</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	_							
8)□		r election requirement.						
· —.	ion Papers	•						
	•	_						
-	The specification is objected to by the Examine		a Evaminar					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			4047.15				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Off	ice Action or form P1O-1:	52.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic rity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stag	e				
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infor	ot(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/3/05 & 9/22/05</u> .	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:)				

Application/Control Number: 09/903,211 Page 2

Art Unit: 2826

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed September 9, 2005 has been entered and new claims 19-21 have been introduced.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7, 15 and 16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The application as originally filed does not specifically support the claim limitation "... without disposition of an electrically-conductive frame in front of the display panel".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher et al. ("Whitcher") USPN 6,144,552 in view of Karasaki ("Karasaki") JP 11-167108 and Meisner et al. ("Meisner") USPN 6,005,642.

Whitcher discloses (see figs. 1 and 2 and col. 3, lines 41-63) a display panel module comprising a display panel 75 defining a screen; a panel-shaped module component superposed on a rear surface of the display panel or opposed to a rear surface of the display panel, the panel-shaped module component excluding a metal frame (as in claim 16); and a rigid plastic bezel 15 having a flat plate frame, and a rigid plastic member 17 coupled to the bezel so as to hold the display panel and the module component against the flat plate frame, but does not specifically disclose an electrically insulating bezel and lacks anticipation of directly receiving a set of display panel and the panel-shape module component.

Karasaki discloses in figs. 1-3 a display panel module comprising a display panel 7 comprising a bezel 1 having a flat plate frame directly receiving a set of display panel and a panel-shape module component.

Meisner discloses (figs. 1 and 2 and col. 9, lines 50-55) a display panel module comprising a display panel comprising an electrically insulating bezel 21/29.

Since Whitcher, Karasaki and Meisner are all from the same field of endeavor, LCD module, Karasaki's and Meisner's teachings would have been recognized in Whitcher's pertinent art. Therefore, in view of Karasaki, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify Whitcher's device by incorporating Karasaki's teachings since that would prevent sudden removal of the LCD module as taught by Karasaki. It

Application/Control Number: 09/903,211

Art Unit: 2826

would have been obvious to substitute Whitcher's rigid plastic bezel with an electrically insulating bezel since that would prevent substantial electric shock hazard as taught by Meisner.

Regarding claim 15, Whitcher discloses (col. 6, lines 9-19) said module component comprising at least a light source (CCFL backlight).

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Meisner discloses the electrically insulating bezel receives the set of display panel and the panel shaped module component without disposition of an electrically-conductive frame in front of the display panel.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Howell et al. ("Howell") USPN 6,353,531 and Meisner.

Whitcher discloses (see figs. 1 and 2 and col. 3, lines 41-63) a display panel 73 defining a screen on a front surface; a panel-shaped module component 17 superposed on a rear surface of the display panel; and an electrically insulating bezel 15 enclosing the display panel and the panel-shaped module component so as to couple the module component to the display panel, but does not specifically disclose an electrically insulating bezel and lacks anticipation of a housing and a display panel module incorporated within the housing.

Howell discloses in figs. 2 and 4 an electronic apparatus comprising a housing 32 and a display panel module 36 incorporated within the housing.

Meisner discloses (figs. 1 and 2 and col. 9, lines 50-55) a display panel module comprising a display panel comprising an electrically insulating bezel 21/29.

Since Whitcher, Howell and Meisner are all from the same field of endeavor, LCD module, Howell's and Meisner's teachings would have been recognized in Whitcher's pertinent art. Therefore, in view of Howell, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2826

was made would be motivated to modify Whitcher's device by incorporating Howell's teachings since that would provide increased protection to critical components as taught by Howell. It would have been obvious to substitute Whitcher's rigid plastic bezel with an electrically insulating bezel since that would prevent substantial electric shock hazard as taught by Meisner.

Regarding claim 21, Meisner discloses the electrically insulating bezel receives the set of display panel and the panel shaped module component without disposition of an electrically-conductive frame in front of the display panel.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Karasaki and Meisner as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Mishima et al. ("Mishima") US PG-Pub 2001/0033265.

The combined references disclose the device structure as recited in the claim but lack anticipation of a liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates.

Mishima discloses (figs. 1, 2, 12, 13 and par. 0133) an electronic apparatus comprising a a display panel 4 including a pair of glass substrates SUB1/SUB2 as outermost panels, liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates.

Therefore, in view of Mishima, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify device of the combined reference by incorporating liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates since that would provide a device free of luminance irregularity as taught by Mishima.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Karasaki and Meisner as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Yamamoto et al. ("Yamamoto") USPN 5,993,027.

Application/Control Number: 09/903,211

Art Unit: 2826

The combined references disclose the device structure as recited in the claim but lack anticipation of a liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates.

Yamamoto discloses in figs. 3 and 4 an electronic apparatus comprising a a display panel 22 including a pair of glass substrates 104/109 as outermost panels, liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates.

Therefore, in view of Yamamoto, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify device of the combined reference by incorporating liquid crystal cells being established between a pair of glass substrates since that would improve image quality as taught by Yamamoto.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2-6 and 9-14 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1921

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 09/903,211

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS

November 27, 2005

NATHAN J. FLYNN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800